arXiv:1303.5124v2 [quant-ph] 30 Apr 2013

All entangled states violate Leggett's crypto-nonlocality

Miguel Navascués
[1]*H.H. Wills Physics Laboratory, University of Bristol,*
Tynd all Avenue, Bristol, BS8 1TL, United Kingdom

In this note, we prove that any set of bipartite correlations compatible with Leggett's hidden variable model must necessarily correspond to the statistics generated by a separable two-qubit state. Consequently, any experiment reporting entanglement between the polarization degrees of freedom of two photons can be interpreted as a violation of Leggett's crypto-nonlocality.

PACS numbers:

In 1935, Einstein, Podolski and Rosen (EPR) argued that quantum mechanics could not be considered a complete theory, as it did not assign definite values to the different observable quantities [1]. This property was called *realism*, and EPR believed that some future physical theory would combine this feature with the astounding predictive powers of quantum mechanics. Bell later reformulated the EPR argument in a device-independent way [2]: by considering experiments conducted by two space-like separated parties, he showed that the predictions of quantum mechanics were incompatible with any realistic theory where distant observables could not influence each other at superluminal speeds. Very recently, Bell's argument has been extended to show that realistic theories with arbitrarily high (but finite) influence propagation speed can neither reproduce the predictions of quantum mechanics [3].

Inspired by Bell's work, Leggett proposed in 2003 a family of theories where the polarization of individual photons was assumed to be a realistic variable and the statistics of polarization measurements, consistent with Malus' law [4]. He called such theories *crypto-nonlocal*. Leggett claimed that certain crypto-nonlocal theories allowed violations of local realism, and thus they were not ruled out by previous experiments of non-locality. Such experiments have been conducted in [5–7].

In this note, we prove that the polarization measurement statistics of a multi-photon experiment in *any* crypto-nonlocal theory must necessarily coincide with the correlations observed when measuring a fully separable state in quantum mechanics. Consequently, all crypto-nonlocal theories are local realistic, and any quantum experiment verifying entanglement between the polarization degrees of freedom of $N > 1$ photons can be considered a refutation of crypto-nonlocality.

First, we will prove our result for the case of two photons and ideal measurements; we will next discuss how to extend our arguments to more than two particles and non-ideal polarizers. Finally, we will state our main conclusions.

The axioms of crypto-nonlocality can be expressed as follows [5]:

1. All measurement outcomes are determined by pre-existing properties of particles independent of the measurement (realism).
2. Physical states are statistical mixtures of subensembles with definite polarization.
3. Polarization is defined such that expectation values taken for each subensemble obey Malus' law.

It follows that the (ontic) state of a photon has an associated unitary vector $\vec{u} \in \mathbb{C}^2$, such that any polarization measurement along the direction $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{C}^2$ will let the photon pass with probability $|\vec{u} \cdot \vec{x}|^2$. That is, we can understand ontic photons as pure qubit states $|u\rangle\langle u|$, and polarization measurements as rank-one projectors $|x\rangle\langle x|$. Equivalently, we can represent the ontic state and the measurement as $\omega_{\vec{u}'} \equiv \frac{\mathbb{I}_2+\vec{u}'\cdot\vec{\sigma}}{2}$ and $\Pi^a_{\vec{x}'} \equiv \frac{\mathbb{I}_2+(-1)^a\vec{x}'\cdot\vec{\sigma}}{2}$ for $a = 0, 1$, respectively, by choosing the unitary vectors $\vec{u}', \vec{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^3$ appropriately.

In this formalism, for any bipartite set of correlations $\{P(a, b|\vec{x}, \vec{y}) : \vec{x}, \vec{y} \in \mathbb{R}^3\}$ compatible with Leggett's axioms, there must exist a distribution $P(\vec{u}, \vec{v})$ such that

$$P(a, b|\vec{x}, \vec{y}) = \sum_{\vec{u},\vec{v}} P(\vec{u}, \vec{v}) P(a, b|\vec{x}, \vec{y}, \vec{u}, \vec{v}), \qquad (1)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \textstyle\sum_a P(a, b|\vec{x}, \vec{y}, \vec{u}, \vec{v}) &= \mathrm{tr}\left(\omega_{\vec{v}}\Pi^b_{\vec{y}}\right), \\ \textstyle\sum_b P(a, b|\vec{x}, \vec{y}, \vec{u}, \vec{v}) &= \mathrm{tr}\left(\omega_{\vec{u}}\Pi^a_{\vec{x}}\right). \end{aligned} \qquad (2)$$

In principle, there may be non-local -or ever supra-quantum- distributions satisfying eq. (1), although we have been unable to find examples in the literature. Note that Leggett's original model [4], or the CHSH violating model presented in [5] only hold for equatorial measurements.

Optimizing Leggett-type functionals over general distributions of this form looks like a very complicated mathematical problem, see [6]. Fortunately, that is not the problem that we are addressing here.

To our best knowledge, it has not been noticed previously that Leggett's axioms impose extra constraints over (1). Indeed, imagine that Alice measures the polarization of her photon in the direction $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, obtaining result

a. Let us make the reasonable assumption that, after Alice interacts with her photon, Bob's particle remains a photon. Then, following Leggett's axioms, Bob's resulting photon state will be described by mixture of pure qubits, i.e., there exist $\rho^0_{\vec{x}}(\vec{u},\vec{v}), \rho^1_{\vec{x}}(\vec{u},\vec{v}) \in B(\mathbb{C}^2)$ with $\rho^0_{\vec{x}}(\vec{u},\vec{v}), \rho^1_{\vec{x}}(\vec{u},\vec{v}) \geq 0$ and $\text{tr}(\rho^0_{\vec{x}}(\vec{u},\vec{v})) = \text{tr}(\rho^1_{\vec{x}}(\vec{u},\vec{v})) = 1$ such that

$$P(b|\vec{x},a,\vec{y},\vec{u},\vec{v}) = \text{tr}\left(\rho^a_{\vec{x}}(\vec{u},\vec{v})\Pi^b_{\vec{y}}\right). \tag{3}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\text{tr}(\omega_{\vec{v}}\Pi^b_{\vec{y}}) = P(b|\vec{x},\vec{y},\vec{u},\vec{v}) = \\ = \textstyle\sum_a P(a|\vec{x},\vec{u},\vec{v})P(b|\vec{x},a,\vec{y},\vec{u},\vec{v}) = \\ = \text{tr}\left(\textstyle\sum_a P(a|\vec{x},\vec{u},\vec{v})\rho^a_{\vec{x}}(\vec{u},\vec{v})\Pi^b_{\vec{y}}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Since this relation holds for all unitary vectors $\vec{y}$, we have that

$$\sum_a P(a|x,\vec{u},\vec{v})\rho^a_{\vec{x}}(\vec{u},\vec{v}) = \omega_{\vec{v}}. \tag{5}$$

Now, $\omega_{\vec{v}}$ is a pure state, so this can only hold if $\rho^a_{\vec{x}}(\vec{u},\vec{v}) = \omega_{\vec{v}}$ for all $\vec{x}, a$. We thus conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}P(a,b|\vec{x},\vec{y},\vec{u},\vec{v}) = P(a|\vec{x},\vec{u},\vec{v})P(b|\vec{x},a,\vec{y},\vec{u},\vec{v}) = \\ = \text{tr}(\omega_{\vec{u}}\Pi^a_{\vec{x}})\text{tr}(\omega_{\vec{v}}\Pi^b_{\vec{y}}).\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

The statistics $\{P(a,b|\vec{x},\vec{y})\}$ hence arise from measurements of the separable state

$$\sum_{\vec{u},\vec{v}} P(\vec{u},\vec{v})\omega_{\vec{u}} \otimes \omega_{\vec{v}}. \tag{7}$$

Conversely, it is easy to see that the statistics generated by any separable two-photon polarization state satisfy Leggett's model. Leggett's crypto-nonlocality is therefore local and equivalent to separable quantum mechanics, and any two-qubit entanglement witness can be regarded as a Leggett inequality.

These arguments can be generalized to more than two parties to conclude that there is a correspondence between N-partite Leggett models and fully separable N-qubit states. Indeed, suppose that N parties share a multiphoton state with well-defined individual polarizations, and imagine that the first $N-1$ parties measure first, thus projecting the state of the N^{th} party into a mixture of photons with definite polarizations. Again (5) holds, and therefore, the last party is uncorrelated from the rest. The general result hence holds by induction.

Finally, accounting for imperfect measurements is easy: following Leggett's original paper [4], the response of non-ideal polarizers can be modeled by the measurement operator $\tilde{\Pi}^a_{\vec{x}} \equiv \epsilon'\mathbb{I}_2 + (1-\epsilon)\Pi^a_{\vec{x}}$, with $0 \leq \epsilon' \leq \epsilon < 1$. For $\epsilon' < \epsilon$, any polarization measurement has a third possible outcome, namely, that no photon is detected. Still, the above operators are tomographically complete, and so, as in the ideal case, it is legit to infer eq. (5) from eq. (4). The rest of the proof is identical to the ideal case.

Conclusion

We have shown that Leggett's notion of crypto-nonlocality can be trivially seen as a bizarre reformulation of quantum separability. The concept of crypto-nonlocality is thus not very exciting from a theoretical point of view, and, from an experimental standpoint, it was refuted way before its birth [8]. With this note we thus hope to put an end to this line of research in the Foundations of Quantum Physics.

Acknowledgements

M. N. has been supported by the Templeton Foundation.

---

[1] Einstein A, Podolsky B, and Rosen N, *Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?.* Phys. Rev. **47** 777 (1935).

[2] Bell JS, *On the EinsteinPoldolskyRosen paradox.* Physics **1** 195-200 (1964).

[3] Bancal J-D, Pironio S, Acín A, Liang Y-C, Scarani V and Gisin N, *Quantum nonlocality based on finite-speed causal influences leads to superluminal signaling.* Nature Physics **8**, 867 (2012).

[4] Leggett AJ, *Non-local Hidden-Variable Theories and Quantum Mechanics: and Incompatibility Theorem.* Found. of Phys. 33, 1469 (2003).

[5] Gröblacher S, Paterek T, Kaltenbaek R, Brukner C, Zukowski M, Aspelmeyer M, and Zeilinger A, *An experimental test of non-local realism.* Nature **446**, 871-875 (2007).

[6] Branciard C, Brunner N, Gisin N, Kurtsiefer C, Lamas-Linares A, Ling A and Scarani V, *Testing quantum correlations versus single-particle properties within Leggett's model and beyond.* Nat. Phys. **4**, 681 - 685 (2008).

[7] Cardano F, Karimi E, Marrucci L, de Lisio C and Santamato E., *Violation of Leggett-type inequalities in the spin-orbit degrees of freedom of a single photon.* arXiv:1304.1738.

[8] Freedman SJ and Clauser JF, *Experimental Test of Local Hidden-Variable Theories.* Phys. Rev. Lett. **28**, 938941 (1972).